

the bias in the reference is decidedly not resilient towards the front: the spring arms (42) bias the lamp up into the ceiling and hence away from the front, and the screw is clearly not a resilient element. Accordingly, this reference does not anticipate claim 34, and so this rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejections of dependent claims 37-40, 43-48, and 53-55 are all predicated on Caluori anticipating independent claim 34, from which each of these rejected claims depends. As Caluori has been shown above not to anticipate claim 34, and actually teaches away from a resilient bias through the use of screws working against the resilient leaf springs 42 that bias the lamp in the direction opposite to that recited in the rejected claims.

The secondary references combined with Caluori are inapposite to the present invention.

Jones (US2002/0080602) is concerned with the appearance of arrays of light fixtures, reducing glare, and directing light from the fixture. The rejection cites Jones for disclosing elements such as a support, front facia having a non-circular cross-section, and a tube extending axially in front of the lamp. Accordingly, Jones does not avoid the deficiencies in Caluori, and so the rejections of claims 37-40 should be withdrawn.

Conners (*et al.*, US 5836677) is alleged to describe a front facia attached via an intermediate member to the support surround. The rejection mischaracterizes the reference, which specifically discloses that element 26 is not a retainer for front facia, but rather is an attachment means for the reflector 10 (col. 4, ln. 20-24). Further, element 18 is not an intermediate member for attachment of facia but, instead, is the upper portion of the reflector (col. 3, ln. 26-35), and so teaches nothing about the non-circular cross section of an intermediate attachment member. The rejection of claims 43-48 should be withdrawn.

Finally, Houplain (EP0233465) is alleged by the rejection to disclose resilient biasing of the lamp towards the front facia by two helical springs (citing Fig. 5 and col. 4,

ln. 60-65).¹ If the rejection has properly characterized element 6 as a front facia (recited as a "fitting support 6" in Houplain's claim 1 at col. 4, ln. 20-42, esp. ln. 27), because the retaining spring 15 connects that element to the lamp (socket cap 13, socket 12, and light fitting 11), allowing the lamp to be moved backwards does not facilitate removal of that "facia" because the spring connects the two. Rather, as recited in Houplain's English claim 1 (at ln. 35-41, emphasis added):

[the] support (9) is provided in its upper part with hooks (16) allowing the said support to be held integrally with the light fitting, and has its base formed by an outer flange (8) *which is a grasping means for withdrawing downwardly the removable assembly of the light fitting and support.*

Thus, Houplain teaches pulling downward (towards the front) the combination of the light fitting (socket and reflector) and support, and says nothing about separation of a front facia from the support. (Compare against applicant's Fig. 1, wherein front facia 76 is separable from support surround 12.) Accordingly, the rejection of claims 53-55 should now be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks, present withdrawal of all of the rejections, and further and favorable action, in the form of a Notice of Allowance, are all believed to be next in order, and such actions are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Bradley N Ruben/

Bradley N. Ruben, Reg. No. 32,058
Bradley N. Ruben, PC
463 1st St., Steo 5A, Hoboken, NJ 07030-1859
201-239-0707 (fax -0734)
mail@rubenpatent.com

23 June 2008

¹ This reference is not entirely in the English language and the examiner has provided no information pursuant to §1.104 explaining the basis for the Office's interpretation of this reference; if the rejection is based on the English language claims of the Houplain European patent, that information should be stated in the rejection.